



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/440,529	11/15/1999	SATYAN G. PITRODA	2683/76979	3076

7590 12/17/2002
WALTER J KAWULA JR ESQ
WELSH KATZ LTD
120 SOUTH RIVERSIDE PLAZA
22ND FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

TREMBLAY, MARK STEPHEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/440,529	PITRODA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Mark Tremblay	2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1, 3-35,37-39 and 44-46 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 25-35,37-39 and 44-46 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Applicant: Pitroda et al.

Filing date: 11/15/99

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine
5 grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or
improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible
harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed.
Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686
F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA
10 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to
overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground
provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this
application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

15 Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal
disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37
CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 3-24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of
20 obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of copending
Application No. 09/587,998, now allowed. Although the conflicting claims are not identical,
they are not patentably distinct from each other because the amendments expressly recite features
which would have been understood from the original claims, when the latter are read in light of
the specification. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the claims would not have been read
25 as incorporating the newly recited limitations, Examiner alternatively finds that it would have
been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to
adapt the receive circuit "to receive information from an electronic transaction device" because
the receive circuit is certainly there to receive something, and it is clear from some of the claims
that "something" is card information, and therefore it must receive it from a device, and since the

device holds information relating to electronic transactions, it is therefore an electronic transaction device. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to adapt the POS interface recited in claim 1 of 09/587,998 to transit the card information received from the receive circuit (and, in turn, from the electronic transaction device), because that is the purpose of the recited "adapter for use with point of sale card readers" as understood from the claim as a whole.

5 This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3-35, 37-39, and 44-46 are allowable over the prior art of record. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) would obviate the double patenting rejection and render all pending claims allowable.

15 The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the recited adapter having a processor, wherein the processor is configured to have adapter identification information. Gutman plainly does not teach this. While a vast number of things are identified by identification information, innumerable things are not identified by any information, other than their inherent functions. The nature of the Gutman invention is to provide identification, but not to everything under the sun.

20 With this in mind, a fair and objective reading of Gutman, in view of the background art, reveals no suggestion to identify the adapter. Of course, it would seem that it could be done. It would not seem extraordinarily difficult to do. But it would not have been obvious to so modify Gutman's invention at the time the Applicant's invention was made in the absence of some suggestion, such as Applicant's specification.

25

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period 5 will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10

Voice

Inquiries for the Examiner should be directed to Mark Tremblay at (703) 305-5176. The Examiner's regular office hours are 10:30 am to 7:00 pm EST Monday to Friday. Voice mail is available. If Applicant has trouble contacting the Examiner, the Supervisory Patent Examiner, Michael Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-3503. Technical questions and comments concerning 15 PTO procedures may be directed to the Patent Assistance Center hotline at 1-800-786-9199 or (703) 308-4357.

20



MARK TREMBLAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

25

December 16, 2002